

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-36 are pending. In light of the amendments and following remarks, Applicant believes all the pending claims are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-32 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,628,943, issued September 30, 2003 to Agrawal et al. (hereinafter "Agrawal"). In the latest Office Action, it was asserted that "Agrawal discloses a gatekeeper that acts as an agent to perform call control operations for a call" (on page 2 citing col. 7, line 42 to col. 8, line 40). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

As described in the specification, a call control operation is one or more of call setup call tear down, call hold call waiting, and the like (see, e.g., page 10, lines 8-11). In a sincere effort to expedite prosecution, Applicant has amended the claims to clarify that call control operations in the claims comprise call setup. Agrawal does not disclose a call agent that performs call control operations comprising call setup for both mobile and non-mobile calls as claimed.

Agent 304 in Agrawal is within the entity of the GK and in fact, the agent instructs the gatekeeper to execute programs that are already stored on the GK (col. 8, lines 1-4). FIG. 3 shows the steps 200-10 through 200-17 that are performed by the agent in Agrawal, which are not call control operations comprising call setup, and more specifically not for both mobile and non-mobile calls. Thus, the claimed call agent does not read on agent 304 in Agrawal.

The Office Action states that "Agrawal further discloses where the gatekeeper (call agent) acts as the central point for **all calls** within its zone and provides call services to registered end points" (page 2, emphasis in original). The gatekeeper is the central point is not what is recited in the claims. The claims recite that a call agent performs call control operations comprising call setup for both mobile and non-mobile calls. Although Agrawal discloses an agent, the agent does not perform the features recited in the claims. Therefore, the reference does not support a prima face case of anticipation.

As Agrawal does not disclose all the features of the claims the claims are patentably distinct over the reference.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant believes all the pending claims are in condition for allowance and should be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would in any way expedite the prosecution of the application, please do not hesitate to call the undersigned at (408) 446-8693.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael J. Ritter", written over the typed name.

Michael J. Ritter
Reg. No. 36,653

RITTER, LANG & KAPLAN LLP
12930 Saratoga Ave., Suite D1
Saratoga, CA 95070
Tel: 408-446-8690
Fax: 408-446-8691